

#14

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 05 2004

OFFICIAL

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK
OFFICE

In Re Application of:)	
William Watson Tiff)	
)	Group Art Unit: 2172
Serial No.: 09,692,433)	
)	Examiner: Liang, Gwen
Filed: October 19, 2000)	
)	Docket No. 051919-1120
For: Rules Analyzer System and Method for)	
Evaluating and Ranking Exact and)	
Probabilistic Search Rules in an Enterprise)	
Database)	

PROPOSED INTERVIEW AGENDA

Agenda Item 1. The Examiner has indicated that dependent claims 3 and 5-8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to overcome the rejection under § 112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant proposes instead that independent claim 1 be amended to include a Markush group which contains the limitations in claims 3 and 5-8. Applicant submits that claim 1 with this proposed amendment would be allowable, for the same reasons that dependent claims 3 and 5-8 are allowable. The suggested amendment is detailed in the next section.

Agenda Item 2. The Examiner has indicated that dependent claims 14 and 16-19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to overcome the rejection under § 112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant proposes instead that independent claim 12 be amended to include a Markush group which contains the limitations in claims 14 and 16-19. Applicant submits that claim 12 with this proposed amendment would be allowable, for the same reasons that dependent claims 14 and 16-19 are allowable. The suggested amendment is detailed in the next section.

Proposed Amendment to Claim 1

1. (Currently Amended) A method for an enterprise system to evaluate and rank probabilistic search rules for searching a computer database of records according to an efficiency measure of each search rule, comprising the steps of:

5 implementing a plurality of search rules that include one or more data elements, wherein a combination of data elements in each rule is configured to identify a target record;

retrieving a plurality of records identified by the search rules as possible matches to the target record;

10 collecting a plurality of counts related to [[the]] a probability of each search rule locating the target record; and

calculating [[a]] the probability [[for]] of each search rule locating the target record;

arranging the search rules in an order based on the probability for each search rule; and

executing the search rules according to the order to retrieve the target record.

15 wherein one of the collected counts is selected from the group of a number of instances that a search rule retrieves one or more records as possible matches to the target record, a number of instances that a search rule retrieves a record previously retrieved by a previously executed search rule, a number of instances that a search rule retrieves a record that was not retrieved by a previously executed search rule, a number of instances that a search rule retrieves a plurality of records wherein the plurality of records are subsequently determined to correspond to the target
20 record, and a number of records of the plurality of retrieved records determined not to be the target record.

Discussion of Proposed Amendment to Claim 1

The amendments to lines 9 and 11 overcome the rejection of claim 1 under § 112 second paragraph. The new limitation on lines 14-21 combines the various “wherein one of the collected counts” limitations from allowable claims 3 and 5-8 into a single Markush group. The last Office Action (mailed March 19, 2004) indicated that the prior art of record does not anticipate or suggest any of the limitations incorporated into claim 1 by this proposed amendment. (Office Action, p. 5). Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 as amended by this proposal would be allowable.

Proposed Amendment to Claim 12

12. (Currently Amended) A computer readable medium having a program for evaluating and ranking probabilistic search rules, the program comprising logic configured to perform the steps of:

5 implementing a plurality of search rules that include one or more data elements, wherein the combination of data elements in each rule is configured to identify a target record;

retrieving a plurality of records identified by the search rules as possible matches to the target record;

10 collecting a plurality of counts related to [[the]] a probability of each search rule locating the target record; and

calculating [[a]] the probability [[for]] of each search rule locating the target record;

arranging the search rules in an order based on the probability for each search rule; and

executing the search rules according to the order to retrieve the target record.

wherein one of the collected counts is selected from the group of a number of instances

15 that a search rule retrieves one or more records as possible matches to the target record, a number of instances that a search rule retrieves a record previously retrieved by a previously executed search rule, a number of instances that a search rule retrieves a record that was not retrieved by a previously executed search rule, a number of instances that a search rule retrieves a plurality of records wherein the plurality of records are subsequently determined to correspond to the target
20 record, and a number of records of the plurality of retrieved records determined not to be the target record.

Discussion of Proposed Amendment to Claim 12

The amendments to lines 9 and 11 overcome the rejection of claim 12 under § 112 second paragraph. The new limitation on lines 14-21 combines the various “wherein one of the collected counts” limitations from allowable claims 14 and 16-19 into a single Markush group. The last Office Action (mailed March 19, 2004) indicated that the prior art of record does not anticipate or suggest any of the limitations incorporated into claim 12 by this proposed amendment. (Office Action, p. 6). Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 12 as amended by this proposal would be allowable.

Conclusion

Applicant requests that the Examiner grant an interview with the Applicant's undersigned attorney to discuss the above items in the proposed Interview Agenda.

Respectfully submitted,


Karen G. Hazzah, Registration No. 48,472

TKHR**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

100 Galleria Pkwy, NW
Suite 1750
Atlanta, GA 30339-5948
www.tkhr.com**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

APR 05 2004

OFFICIALKaren G. Hazzah
(770) 933-9500

karen.hazzah@tkhr.com

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

April 5, 2004

[51919-1120]**TO**

Examiner Gwen Liang

FAX: (703) 746-8376

FROM

Karen G. Hazzah

FAX: 770-951-0933

TEL:

TEL: 770-933-9500

RE: Proposed Interview Agenda
Serial No.: 09/692,433

(Message) Examiner Hu: Here is a proposed interview agenda as you requested. Please let me know what time and date is convenient for you.

Number of Pages (Including This Cover Sheet): - 5 - Page(s)
PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE SAFE AND CLEAR RECEIPT OF ALL PAGES.

CONFIDENTIAL

The information in this facsimile message is legally privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us by telephone and return the original message to us at the address above via the United States Postal Service. Thank you.

INTERNATIONAL PATENT, TRADEMARK AND COPYRIGHT LAW AND RELATED LITIGATION

◆ Atlanta, Georgia ◆ Huntsville, Alabama ◆